arXiv:1407.8058v1 [gr-qc] 28 Jul 2014

If time is a local observable, then Hawking radiation is unitary

Hrvoje Nikolić
Theoretical Physics Division, Rudjer Bošković Institute,
P.O.B. 180, HR-10002 Zagreb, Croatia
e-mail: hnikolic@irb.hr

July 31, 2014

Abstract

In the usual formulation of quantum theory, time is a global classical evolution parameter, not a local quantum observable. On the other hand, both canonical quantum gravity (which lacks fundamental time-evolution parameter) and the principle of spacetime covariance (which insists that time should be treated on an equal footing with space) suggest that quantum theory should be slightly reformulated, in a manner that promotes time to a local observable. Such a reformulated quantum theory is unitary in a more general sense than the usual quantum theory. In particular, this promotes the non-unitary Hawking radiation to a unitary phenomenon, which avoids the black-hole information paradox.

Keywords: time, local observable, unitarity, Hawking radiation

1 Introduction

Black-hole information paradox [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10] is one of the most controversial conceptual puzzles in modern physics. Recently, a very active debate on the paradox has been stimulated by the work of Almheiri, Marolf, Polchinski and Sully [11]. In this work, they start from 3 reasonable assumptions

1. Hawking radiation is unitary,
2. low energy field theory is valid near horizon,
3. freely falling observer sees nothing special at the horizon,

and derive a contradiction. To resolve the contradiction, they argue that assumption 3. is wrong, i.e. that there must be a firewall at the horizon seen even by freely falling observers. In this paper we defend a less popular possibility, that it is assumption 1. which is wrong. In other words, we defend the possibility that Hawking radiation is *not* unitary.

How can the absence of unitarity be compatible with quantum mechanics (QM)? We argue that Hawking radiation is not "unitary" in the usual meaning of this word, but is unitary in a slightly *generalized* sense. In this way all 3 assumptions can be simultaneously satisfied, if only the notion of "unitarity" is slightly generalized.

The main idea rests on the fact that the usual notion of "unitarity" means that the *time evolution* is unitary. In our proposal of generalized unitarity there is time, but there is no time *evolution*. Therefore, without time-evolution in general, there can be no non-unitary time evolution in particular. But if there is no time evolution, then what time is? Our answer is that time is a *local observable*. By contrast, in standard QM time is neither local nor an observable. It is not an observable because in a time-dependent state $|\psi(t)\rangle$, t is an external classical parameter, not a quantum operator. It is not local because there is only one parameter t, which parametrizes the *whole* space-like hypersurface on which $|\psi\rangle$ is defined.

One way to generalize time t to a local quantity is by the Tomonaga-Schwinger formalism [12, 13], in which one makes the replacement

$$t \to T(\mathbf{x}), \tag{1}$$

so that each space-point $\mathbf{x}$ has another time parameter $T(\mathbf{x})$. In this way, the Schrödinger equation

$$H\psi(t) = i\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\psi(t) \tag{2}$$

generalizes to the Tomonaga-Schwinger equation

$$\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{x})\psi[T] = i\frac{\delta}{\delta T(\mathbf{x})}\psi[T], \tag{3}$$

where $\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{x})$ is the local Hamiltonian density. But in this formalism, $T(\mathbf{x})$ is still a collection of (infinitely many) classical parameters, not a collection of quantum observables. Quantum state is still defined on an (arbitrarily curved) space-like hypersurface with fixed $T(\mathbf{x})$.

So, how to make t a quantum observable? For that purpose consider the quantum probability density

$$p(q,t) = |\psi(q,t)|^2. \tag{4}$$

When we say that t is a classical parameter, we mean that $p(q,t)$ is the probability of q *at* t, i.e. that probability obeys

$$\int dq\, p(q,t) = 1 \quad \text{for all } t. \tag{5}$$

This property corresponds to unitarity in the usual sense.

Analogously, to say that t is a quantum observable, means that $p(q,t)$ is the probability of q *and of* t, i.e. that probability obeys

$$\int dq\, dt\, p(q,t) = 1. \tag{6}$$

This property corresponds to our unitarity in the generalized sense.

Such a generalized unitarity implies that t is just like any other observable q. For example, since evolution of space (for constant time) does not make sense, it implies that evolution of time itself also does not make sense. This suggests the block-universe picture of the world, according to which there is no evolution of time at the fundamental level, while past, presence and future all "simultaneously" exist.

The block-universe picture has both advantages and disadvantages. The main advantage is a consistency with classical relativity, because t is treated on an equal footing with $\mathbf{x}$ and spacetime is viewed as a single 4-dimensional object. The main disadvantage is a contradiction with our intuitive (psychological) experience of time. In this paper we study what we can cure if we try to swallow the counter-intuitive pill of the block universe. In particular, we study how it helps to solve the black-hole information paradox.

Our main result can be understood in simple terms as follows. For times after the evaporation, the inside particle does not longer exist, which implies that information about that particle is destroyed. But if we think of it as a block universe, the inside particle is not really destroyed; it exists in the past!

For such an interpretation to work, however, it is important that time is *local*. Namely, locality implies that each particle has its own time variable, so different particles may co-exist at *different* times.

For such an interpretation to work, it is also important that time is an *observable*. Namely, it guarantees that "co-existence" at different *times* should be interpreted in the same way as co-existence at different positions in *space*.

In the rest of the paper it remains to see how to explicitly realize this general idea in a more concrete theoretical framework. We discuss two different approaches. In Sec. 2 we study canonical quantum gravity, while in Sec. 3 we study a space-time covariant theory. The conclusions are drawn in Sec. 4.

2 Canonical approach

2.1 Canonical quantum gravity and the concept of time

Canonical quantum gravity is based on the Hamiltonian constraint

$$\mathcal{H}\Psi[g,\phi] = 0, \tag{7}$$

where $\mathcal{H}$ is the Hamiltonian-density operator and $\Psi[g,\phi]$ is the wave function of the universe, depending on gravitational and matter degrees of freedom denoted by g and ϕ, respectively. (On the technical level, the most promising variant of (7) is based on loop quantum gravity [14], where g denotes the loop variables.) Clearly,

$\Psi[g,\phi]$ does not depend on an external time parameter, which is often referred to as problem of time in quantum gravity (see e.g. [15, 16] for older reviews and [14] for a review written from a more modern perspective). Obviously, since $\Psi[g,\phi]$ does not depend on time, the information encoded in $\Psi[g,\phi]$ cannot depend on time either, i.e. information cannot be "lost". The lack of time dependence can be thought of as "time evolution" described by a trivial unitary operator

$$U(t) \equiv 1, \tag{8}$$

which means that the theory is unitary in a trivial sense. The quantity

$$\rho[g,\phi] = \Psi^*[g,\phi]\Psi[g,\phi] \tag{9}$$

can be interpreted as probability of given values g and ϕ, provided that $\Psi[g,\phi]$ is normalized such that

$$\int \mathcal{D}g\,\mathcal{D}\phi\,\Psi^*[g,\phi]\Psi[g,\phi] = 1. \tag{10}$$

In loop quantum gravity, the formal measure $\mathcal{D}g$ is mathematically well defined, and there are justified expectations that $\mathcal{D}\phi$ could be well defined too.

Even though there is no fundamental notion of time, a phenomenological notion of time can still be introduced. The most physical way to do it is to introduce a clock-time [14]. Essentially, this means that some of the matter degrees of freedom describe the reading of a "clock". In this case the Hamiltonian $H = \int d^3x\,\mathcal{H}$ can be split as

$$H = \tilde{H} + H_{\text{clock}}, \tag{11}$$

where H_{clock} describes the clock and $\tilde{H}$ is the rest of the Hamiltonian. The Hamiltonian for a good clock can be approximated by a Hamiltonian of the form

$$H_{\text{clock}} \simeq \lambda P_{\text{clock}}, \tag{12}$$

where $\phi \equiv \{\tilde{\phi}, Q_{\text{clock}}\}$, Q_{clock} is the configuration variable representing the reading of the clock, P_{clock} is the canonical momentum conjugated to Q_{clock}, and λ is a coupling constant. Indeed, the resulting classical equation of motion

$$\frac{dQ_{\text{clock}}}{dt} = \frac{\partial H_{\text{clock}}}{\partial P_{\text{clock}}} \simeq \lambda \tag{13}$$

implies

$$Q_{\text{clock}}(t) \simeq \lambda t, \tag{14}$$

so Q_{clock} increases approximately linearly with time, which means that the value of Q_{clock} is a good measure of time.

In quantum theory the momentum P_{clock} is the derivative operator

$$P_{\text{clock}} = -i\frac{\partial}{\partial Q_{\text{clock}}}, \tag{15}$$

so (12) can be written as

$$H_{\text{clock}} \simeq -i\frac{\partial}{\partial q_{\text{clock}}}, \tag{16}$$

where $q_{\rm clock} \equiv \lambda^{-1} Q_{\rm clock}$. In this way, (7) implies a Schrodinger-like equation

$$\tilde{H}\Psi[g,\tilde{\phi},q_{\rm clock}] \simeq i\frac{\partial}{\partial q_{\rm clock}}\Psi[g,\tilde{\phi},q_{\rm clock}]. \tag{17}$$

Even though (17) has the same form as the usual Schrödinger equation, we stress two important differences with respect to the usual interpretation of time in the Schrödinger equation. First, $q_{\rm clock}$ is a *quantum* observable, not a classical external parameter. Second, in most cases $q_{\rm clock}$ is a *local* quantity, not a quantity that can be associated with a whole spacelike hypersurface. As we shall see, these two features are essential for our resolution of the black-hole information paradox.

2.2 Implications on black-hole information paradox

Now assume that $\Psi[g,\phi]$ is a solution of (7) that describes an evaporating black hole. Of course, an explicit construction of such a solution is prohibitively difficult. Yet, under reasonable assumptions justified by understanding of semi-classical black holes, some qualitative features of such a hypothetical solution can easily be guessed without an explicit solution at hand. In particular, it is reasonable to assume that, at least approximately, the degrees of freedom can be split into inside and outside degrees of freedom. Therefore we write

$$\Psi[g,\phi] = \Psi[g_{\rm in},\phi_{\rm in},g_{\rm out},\phi_{\rm out}]. \tag{18}$$

This state can also be represented by a pure-state density matrix

$$\rho[g_{\rm in},\phi_{\rm in},g_{\rm out},\phi_{\rm out}|g'_{\rm in},\phi'_{\rm in},g'_{\rm out},\phi'_{\rm out}] = \Psi[g_{\rm in},\phi_{\rm in},g_{\rm out},\phi_{\rm out}]\Psi^*[g'_{\rm in},\phi'_{\rm in},g'_{\rm out},\phi'_{\rm out}]. \tag{19}$$

By tracing out over the inside degrees of freedom, we get the mixed-state density matrix

$$\rho_{\rm out}[g_{\rm out},\phi_{\rm out}|g'_{\rm out},\phi'_{\rm out}] = \int \mathcal{D}g_{\rm in}\,\mathcal{D}\phi_{\rm in}\,\rho[g_{\rm in},\phi_{\rm in},g_{\rm out},\phi_{\rm out}|g_{\rm in},\phi_{\rm in},g'_{\rm out},\phi'_{\rm out}], \tag{20}$$

which describes information available to an outside observer. Next we identify a clock-time of an outside observer, so that we can write

$$\rho_{\rm out}[g_{\rm out},\phi_{\rm out}|g'_{\rm out},\phi'_{\rm out}] = \rho_{\rm out}[g_{\rm out},\tilde{\phi}_{\rm out},q_{\rm clock\ out}|g'_{\rm out},\tilde{\phi}'_{\rm out},q'_{\rm clock\ out}]. \tag{21}$$

Finally, by considering the clock-diagonal matrix elements $q_{\rm clock\ out} = q'_{\rm clock\ out} \equiv t$, we get an "evolving" outside density matrix

$$\rho_{\rm out}[g_{\rm out},\tilde{\phi}_{\rm out}|g'_{\rm out},\tilde{\phi}'_{\rm out}](t) \equiv \rho_{\rm out}[g_{\rm out},\tilde{\phi}_{\rm out},t|g'_{\rm out},\tilde{\phi}'_{\rm out},t]. \tag{22}$$

Clearly, the t-evolution described by (22) may not be unitary. At times t for which the black hole has evaporated completely, (22) may correspond to a mixed state, in accordance with predictions of the semi-classical theory [1]. One could think that it is merely a restatement of the information paradox, but it is actually much more than that. Unlike the standard statement of the paradox [1], such a restatement

contains also a resolution of the paradox. Namely, from the construction of (22) it is evident that there is nothing fundamental about such a violation of unitarity. No information is really lost. The full information content is encoded in the pure state (19) equivalent to the wave function (18). This is very different from the information loss in the standard formulation [1], where information seems to be really lost and no description in terms of pure states seems possible.

To see more explicitly where the information is hidden, it is useful to introduce *two* clocks, such that (18) can be written as

$$\Psi[g_{\rm in},\phi_{\rm in},g_{\rm out},\phi_{\rm out}]=\Psi[g_{\rm in},\tilde{\phi}_{\rm in},q_{\rm clock\ in},g_{\rm out},\tilde{\phi}_{\rm out},q_{\rm clock\ out}]. \tag{23}$$

Here $q_{\rm clock\ in}$ and $q_{\rm clock\ out}$ are configuration variables describing an inside clock and an outside clock, respectively. Assuming that the black hole eventually evaporates completely, the inside clock cannot show a time larger than some value $t_{\rm evap}$ corresponding to the time needed for the complete evaporation. More precisely, the probability that $q_{\rm clock\ in} > t_{\rm evap}$ is vanishing, so

$$\Psi[g_{\rm in},\tilde{\phi}_{\rm in},q_{\rm clock\ in},g_{\rm out},\tilde{\phi}_{\rm out},q_{\rm clock\ out}]=0 \quad \text{for} \quad q_{\rm clock\ in} > t_{\rm evap}. \tag{24}$$

The existence of the wave function (23) implies that the system can be described by a pure state even after the complete evaporation. However, this description is trivial, because (24) says that the wave function has a vanishing value for $q_{\rm clock\ in} > t_{\rm evap}$. Still, even a nontrivial pure-state description for $q_{\rm clock\ out} > t_{\rm evap}$ is possible, provided that $q_{\rm clock\ in}$ is restricted to the region $q_{\rm clock\ in} < t_{\rm evap}$. In this case (23) describes the correlations between the outside degrees of freedom after the complete evaporation and the inside degrees of freedom before the complete evaporation. In other words, if one asks where the information after the complete evaporation is hidden, then the answer is – *it is hidden in the past*. Of course, experimentalists cannot travel to the past, so information is lost for the experimentalists. Yet, this information loss is described by a pure state, so one does not need to use the Hawking formalism [1] in which a state evolves from a pure to a mixed state. By avoiding this formalism one avoids its pathologies [17] too, which may be viewed as the main advantage of our approach.

One might object that information hidden in the past is the same as information destruction, but it is not. The difference is subtle and essential for our approach, so let us explain it once again more carefully. Information hidden in the past and information destruction are the same for an observer who views the world as an entity that evolves with time t in (22). However, such a view of the world is emergent rather than fundamental, because time is emergent rather than fundamental. At the fundamental level there is no time and no evolution. The fundamental world is static and unitary, as described by (8). The concept of "past" refers to something which does not longer exist at the emergent level, but it still exists at the fundamental level. Thus, at the fundamental level, information is better described as being *present* in the past and only *hidden* for an emergent observer, rather than being destroyed. In this sense, our resolution of the information paradox does not remove the non-unitary time evolution entirely. Instead, *it shifts the non-unitary time evolution from a fundamental level to an emergent one*.

One might still argue that we have only shifted the problem (from one level to another) and not really solved it. But in our view such a shift of the problem is also a solution, or at least a crucial part of a solution. Namely, it is typical for emergent theories in physics that they lack full self-consistency, even when the underlying fundamental theories are self-consistent. Indeed, a presence of an inconsistency in an otherwise successful physical theory is often a sign that this theory is not fundamental, but emergent. (A classic example is the ultraviolet catastrophe in classical statistical mechanics. It was resolved by Planck and others by recognizing that classical statistical mechanics emerges from more fundamental quantum statistical mechanics, which does not involve the ultraviolet catastrophe. In this way the inconsistency of classical statistical mechanics was not removed, but shifted from a fundamental to an emergent level.) In our case of the black-hole information paradox, the emergent theory is not self-consistent as it violates unitarity. We resolve the problem by identifying a more fundamental unitary theory from which the unitarity-violating theory emerges. The unitarity violation is nothing but a sign that *the emergent description in terms of time evolution is not fully applicable to the phenomenon of black-hole evaporation, and the fundamental theory involving no time evolution is a more appropriate description.* In our opinion, it is a legitimate resolution of the black-hole information paradox, even if an unexpected one.

3 Covariant approach

The covariant approach has already been presented elsewhere [18, 19] (see also [20, 21]), so here we only sketch the main ideas. For simplicity, we consider a system with a fixed number of particles, but the generalization to uncertain number of particles is also possible [18].

3.1 Many-time formalism and spacetime probability

A single-time wave function in standard QM

$$\psi(\mathbf{x}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_n, t) \tag{25}$$

generalizes to the many-time wave function [22, 23, 24, 25, 12, 26]

$$\psi(\mathbf{x}_1, t_1 \ldots, \mathbf{x}_n, t_n). \tag{26}$$

The standard single-time wave function is just a special case of the many-time wave function

$$\psi(\mathbf{x}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_n, t) = \psi(\mathbf{x}_1, t_1 \ldots, \mathbf{x}_n, t_n)|_{t_1=\cdots=t_n=t}. \tag{27}$$

The many-time wave function allows a covariant notation

$$\psi(\mathbf{x}_1, t_1 \ldots, \mathbf{x}_n, t_n) = \psi(x_1, \ldots, x_n), \tag{28}$$

where $x = (\mathbf{x}, t)$.

The probability dP that particles will be found around points $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ is postulated to be [27, 28, 29]

$$dP = |\psi(x_1, \ldots, x_n)|^2 d^4x_1 \cdots d^4x_n. \tag{29}$$

This is the probability in *spacetime*, which was first proposed in [30].

Concerning the n-particle interpretation of the wave function $\psi(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$, there is a conceptual subtlety which requires a clarification. The n-point wave function $\psi(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ is obtained by acting n times with the particle-creation operator on the vacuum [28]. In this sense, even when the separation between the points $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ is timelike, these points should be interpreted as positions of n separate particles, not as one particle measured at n times. However, in curved spacetime the choice of the vacuum (which determines the corresponding particle-creation operators) is not unique [31]. Different splits of spacetime into space and time lead to different "natural" choices of the vacuum and the corresponding particles. A way to choose the vacuum and particles in a unique manner is to introduce a preferred time, which seems particularly plausible in the context of Horava gravity [32].

From (29), the standard probability in *space* can be recovered in the following way. If one *knows* that particles are detected at times

$$t_1 = \cdots = t_n = t, \tag{30}$$

then space probability is the *conditional probability*

$$dP_{(3n)} = \frac{|\psi(\mathbf{x}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_n, t)|^2 d^3x_1 \cdots d^3x_n}{N_t}, \tag{31}$$

with the normalization factor

$$N_t = \int |\psi(\mathbf{x}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_n, t)|^2 d^3x_1 \cdots d^3x_n. \tag{32}$$

This is the standard probability in space.

3.2 Application to black-hole information paradox

Assume that black hole evaporates completely after time $t_{\rm evap}$. This implies that the probability of detecting inside particle for $t > t_{\rm evap}$ is zero, so the inside modes satisfy

$$\psi_l^{(\rm in)}(\mathbf{x}_{\rm in}, t_{\rm in})|_{t_{\rm in} > t_{\rm evap}} = 0. \tag{33}$$

The outside modes $\psi_k^{(\rm out)}(x_{\rm out})$ do not vanish for $t > t_{\rm evap}$.

Now consider a Hawking pair of particles. Their most general entangled wave function is

$$\psi(x_{\rm in}, x_{\rm out}) = \sum_l \sum_k c_{lk} \psi_l^{(\rm in)}(x_{\rm in}) \psi_k^{(\rm out)}(x_{\rm out}), \tag{34}$$

which is equivalent to the pure-state density matrix

$$\rho(x_{\rm in}, x_{\rm out} | x'_{\rm in}, x'_{\rm out}) = \psi(x_{\rm in}, x_{\rm out}) \psi^*(x'_{\rm in}, x'_{\rm out}). \tag{35}$$

The outside state is a mixed state

$$\rho^{(\mathrm{out})}(x_{\mathrm{out}}|x'_{\mathrm{out}}) = \int d^4x_{\mathrm{in}}\, |g(x_{\mathrm{in}})|^{1/2}\, \rho(x_{\mathrm{in}}, x_{\mathrm{out}}|x_{\mathrm{in}}, x'_{\mathrm{out}}). \tag{36}$$

Now the information paradox resolves in a way similar to that in the canonical approach. First, time is *local* because each particle at space-position $\mathbf{x}_a$ has its own time t_a. In general $t_1 \neq t_2 \neq \cdots \neq t_n$. Second, time is an *observable* because in (29) time is interpreted in the same way as the space position. Therefore, different particles may co-exist at different times. As a consequence information is not lost, in the sense that the wave function describes a correlation of the outside particle after the evaporation with the inside particle before the evaporation.

4 Conclusion

The possibility that information is destroyed after the black-hole evaporation is not ruled out. In this paper we have argued that this destruction may be an illusion, in the sense that information may still be hidden in the past. Such a possibility has both advantages and disadvantages. A disadvantage is the fact that such a view contradicts our intuitive notion of time evolution. An advantage is the fact that it looks natural from the mathematical point of view.

In particular, such a view is natural in the canonical approach. Namely, canonical quantum gravity lacks a fundamental notion of time evolution, which implies trivial unitarity of the theory at the fundamental level. Time and evolution are emergent concepts, defined with the aid of a physical clock. In general, such a clock-time only has a local meaning and is represented by a quantum observable.

In addition, such a view is also natural in the covariant approach, if we insist that time should be treated on an equal footing with space.

In both approaches, information present on a global spacelike hypersurface does not play any fundamental role. Consequently, even if observers living after the complete evaporation of a black hole cannot see all information encoded in the wave function of the universe, which can be interpreted as effective violation of unitarity for the observers, the full wave function of the universe still contains all the information and no fundamental violation of unitarity takes place. In this way both fundamental unitarity and phenomenological information loss may peacefully coexist, which resolves the black-hole information paradox.

In this way, both approaches support the idea that if time is a local observable, then Hawking radiation is unitary.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the Ministry of Science of the Republic of Croatia under Contract No. 098-0982930-2864.

References

[1] S. Hawking, *Phys. Rev. D* **14** (1976) 2460.

[2] S. B. Giddings, *Phys. Rev. D* **46** (1992) 1347.

[3] J. A. Harvey and A. Strominger, hep-th/9209055.

[4] J. Preskill, hep-th/9209058.

[5] D. N. Page, hep-th/9305040.

[6] S. B. Giddings, hep-th/9412138.

[7] A. Strominger, hep-th/9501071.

[8] S. D. Mathur, *Lect. Notes Phys.* **769** (2009) 3; arXiv:0803.2030.

[9] S. Hossenfelder and L. Smolin, *Phys. Rev. D* **81** (2010) 064009; arXiv:0901.3156.

[10] A. Fabbri and J. Navarro-Salas, *Modeling Black Hole Evaporation* (Imperial College Press, London, 2005).

[11] A. Almheiri, D. Marolf, J. Polchinski and J. Sully, JHEP **1302** (2013) 062; arXiv:1207.3123.

[12] S. Tomonaga, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **1** (1946) 27.

[13] J. Schwinger, *Phys. Rev.* **74** (1948) 1439.

[14] C. Rovelli, *Quantum Gravity* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2004).

[15] C. J. Isham, gr-qc/9210011.

[16] K. Kuchar, in G. Kunstatter, D. Vincent and J. Williams (eds.), Proceedings of the 4th Canadian Conference on General Relativity and Relativistic Astrophysics (1992).

[17] T. Banks, M. E. Peskin and L. Susskind, *Nucl. Phys. B* **244** (1984) 125.

[18] H. Nikolić, *Phys. Lett. B* **678** (2009) 218; arXiv:0905.0538.

[19] H. Nikolić, *Int. J. Quantum Inf.* **10** (2012) 1250024; arXiv:0912.1938.

[20] J. B. Hartle, *Phys. Rev. D* **51** (1995) 1800.

[21] J. B. Hartle, gr-qc/9705022.

[22] P. A. M. Dirac, *Proc. Roy. Soc. London* **136** (1932) 453.

[23] L. Rosenfeld, *Z. Physik* **76** (1932) 729.

[24] P. A. M. Dirac, V. A. Fock and B. Podolsky, *Phys. Z. USSR* **2** (1932) 468.

[25] F. Bloch, *Phys. Z. USSR* **5** (1934) 301.

[26] S. Petrat and R. Tumulka, arXiv:1308.1065.

[27] H. Nikolić, *Int. J. Quantum Inf.* **7** (2009) 595; arXiv:0811.1905.

[28] H. Nikolić, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **25** (2010) 1477; arXiv:0904.2287.

[29] H. Nikolić, *Int. J. Quantum Inf.* **9** (2011) 367; arXiv:1002.3226.

[30] E. C. G. Stückelberg, Helv. Phys. Acta **14** (1941) 322; Helv. Phys. Acta **14** (1941) 588.

[31] N. D. Birrell and P. C. W. Davies, *Quantum Fields in Curved Space* (Cambridge Press, NY, 1982).

[32] H. Nikolić, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **25**, 1595 (2010); arXiv:0904.3412.